

~~SECRET~~

Journal

Office of Legislative Counsel

Thursday - 23 June 1955

1. Following the testimony on appropriations for construction of the CIA building, Cong. Scrivner stated that he was greatly disturbed by the news reports on new Soviet bombers, particularly as the Committee had received testimony "from high military sources" that

25X6
25X6

The DCI pointed out that this could be the result of the accident of location and the line of flight of the planes. I have discussed this matter with the DD/I and AD/OCI, who are preparing a little briefing paper for the DCI in order that the latter may consider saying something further to Cong. Scrivner. At that time he will also consider discussing certain information on guided missiles which Mr. Scrivner has requested, and whether to give him any briefing prior to his trip to Morocco, Spain, Italy, Greece and Turkey.

2. Cong. Charles B. Deane (D., N. Car.) said during the hearing this morning that he would like to come down sometime to hear a little about CIA and meet some of its people. I called the Congressman and arranged for him to lunch with the DCI on July 11. Mr. Deane told me that he would like to bring a short film with him which might be used for psychological warfare purposes in Africa, and stated that the Communist infiltration of that Continent was a source of great concern to him. He indicated his support for the building.

25X1C

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1C



4. The DCI appeared before the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in support of an appropriation for the construction of a CIA headquarters installation. He was accompanied by Col. White, Mr. Saunders, [redacted] and Mr. Pforzheimer. The Subcommittee members present included Chairman Mahon, Cong. Sheppard, Sikes, Riley, Deane and Flood, Democrats, and Scrivner, Ford, Miller, and Davis, Republicans.

25X1C

The Chairman took the DCI aside and warned him that Mr. Flood would be extremely difficult on many points. The Chairman opened the hearing by asking the DCI to present his assistants. The DCI indicated that Mr. Pforzheimer was his Congressional Liaison man; whereupon Mr. Flood commented that it was the first time he knew CIA had a Legislative Liaison man, and seemed to question why the DCI needed one. The DCI pointed out that I was a part of the Legal staff and also carried duties in that connection. (It should be noted that I have been in correspondence with Cong. Flood in approximately 25 different instances since 1947). As the hearing progressed, Cong. Sikes pointed out that the Chairman was calling this hearing purely on the matter of the CIA building and not allowing substantive questions regarding the Agency; that a special subcommittee had always handled the CIA budget; and he saw no reason why that subcommittee should not also handle the building as he did not know enough about CIA to pass on our need. Mr. Flood broke in at this point to state that he had never been one of the "sacred cows" privileged to hear about the CIA budget, although he was privy to many of the secrets of the military. He said that he was against the policy of a special subcommittee on CIA appropriations, but as long as that was the policy the special subcommittee should handle the matter as he knew neither the size of the Agency, or its functions, or its needs for a building. After this colloquy, Cong. Flood left the hearing. (Mr. Sikes' statement is a little strange, as he has several times sat on CIA appropriations. However, he was not included in this year's special subcommittee and may be annoyed in this regard. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Sikes also left).

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

Mr. Mahon stated that he felt, in his opinion, that it was proper for the entire subcommittee to hear testimony regarding the CIA building as there was nothing particularly secret about the building, and it would be there for all to see. At one point during the above, as the DCI attempted to answer a question, Mr. Flood told the Director that the Director need not answer any questions at the moment because "this is purely a family matter".

The subcommittee appeared impressed with the security needs for the building, and did not raise the questions of dispersal to the extent raised by the Armed Services Committees, and, in fact, did not comment adversely on either of the possible Virginia sites -- Langley or the Winkler tract. They expressed no opposition to the problem of extending the George Washington Memorial Parkway, but they asked that we submit a statement as to financing. The Chairman pressed the DCI for assurances that the proposed building would be austere and would not turn out to be an architectural nightmare. He pointed out that for a building such as ours the architecture's imagination might run riot. The DCI gave assurances on these points.

SECRET